

Remarks

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1-12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 13 is amended. Claims 15-24 have been added. A total of 12 claims are presented, including one independent claim. Applicants believe that no additional claim fees are due.

New claims 15-24 are supported in the specification as filed, for example, in the originally filed claims. No new matter has been added.

§ 102 and § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 4-7, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(b) as obvious over JP 10-316955 Patent Abstract.

Without prejudice or disclaimer, applicants have cancelled claims 1-12, mooted this rejection. Thus, the rejection of claims 1, 4-7, 10 and 11 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(b) as obvious over JP 10-316955 Patent Abstract should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '955 Patent Abstract.

Without prejudice or disclaimer, applicants have cancelled claims 2, 3, 8, 9, and 12, mooted this rejection as to those claims. As to claims 13 and 14, the Examiner has not shown how JP '955 describes, teaches, or suggests all of the elements of these method claims. For example, amended claim 13, *inter alia*, requires sealing a plurality of chip-type devices at one time. The Examiner has not shown where JP '955 describes, teaches, or suggests this method.

The rejection of claims 2, 3, 8, 9, and 12-14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '955 Patent Abstract has been mooted in part and overcome in part and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate et al.

Without prejudice or disclaimer, applicants have cancelled claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, and 12, mooted this rejection. Thus, the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, and 12 under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Kawate et al. should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate et al.

Without prejudice or disclaimer, applicants have cancelled claims 2, 3, 7, 10, and 11, mooted this rejection as to those claims. As to claims 13 and 14, the Examiner has not shown how Kawate describes, teaches, or suggests all of the elements of these method claims. For example, amended claim 13, *inter alia*, requires scaling a plurality of chip-type devices at one time. The Examiner has not shown where Kawate describes, teaches, or suggests this method.

Thus, the rejection of claims 2, 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, and 14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate et al. has been mooted in part and overcome in part and should be withdrawn..

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Allowance of claims 13-24, as amended, at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

April 6, 2006

Date

By: /Dean M. Harts/

Dean M. Harts, Reg. No.: 47,634

Telephone No.: 651-737-2325

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833